

### REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-7, 18, 19, 28 and 29 are pending in the above-identified application. In the non-final Office Action dated August 23, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-7, 18, 19, 28, and 29 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Shimizu et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,386,668) in view of *Harvey, et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,014,153). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and address the Examiner's disposition below.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 6, 18, 28, and 29 have been amended. Claim 3 has been canceled.

Claims 1, 5, 6, 18, 28, and 29, each as amended, each claim subject matter relating to an one ink-ejecting mechanism having a printer head having a print width. A plurality of head chips are formed on the printer head. A plurality of nozzles are formed within a plurality of nozzle arrays positioned on a single nozzle plate, the plurality of nozzles associated with each head chip. Nozzles associated with one head chip and nozzles associated with an adjacent head chip partly overlap along at least one direction to form an overlapped area on a print object such that when the at least one ink-ejecting mechanism drives across the print object the nozzles of the one head chip and the nozzles of the adjacent head chip respectively eject inks which are mixed in the overlapped area to reduce dot density differences on the print object.

As shown in the illustrative example of Figure 28, the ink-ejecting mechanism is driven such that there is a shiftable boundary (K) in the overlapped area. Inks ejected from the one head chip (*e.g.*, head chip A) are only on a first side of the shiftable boundary (K) and inks ejected from the adjacent head chip (*e.g.*, head chip B) are only on an opposite side of the shiftable boundary (K).

This is clearly unlike *Shimizu* in view of *Harvey*, which fails to disclose or suggest an ink-ejecting mechanism that is driven such that there is a shiftable boundary in an overlapped area, wherein inks ejected from one head chip are only on a first side of the shiftable boundary and inks ejected from an adjacent head chip are only on an opposite side of the shiftable boundary. Referring to *Shimizu* Figure 28B, *Shimizu* discloses adjacent print heads 232 and 233 that overlap in an overlapped area (overlapping nozzles A-L and l-a). As clearly shown, in the overlapped area, ink from adjacent print heads 232 and 233 always mix. For example, in row 1, at columns 9-16, inks from print heads 232 and 233 mix. Nowhere does *Shimizu* suggest a shiftable boundary, at which inks ejected from one head chip are only on a first side of a

shiftable boundary and inks ejected from an adjacent head chip are only on an opposite side of the shiftable boundary. Instead, *Shimizu*'s inks from adjacent print heads always overlap onto each other. Thus, unlike Applicants' claimed invention, *Shimizu* fails to disclose inks ejected from one head chip are only on a first side of a shiftable boundary and inks ejected from an adjacent head chip are only on an opposite side of the shiftable boundary.

*Harvey* also fails to disclose or suggest Applicants' claimed shiftable boundary in an overlapped area. Therefore, *Shimizu* in view of *Harvey* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 5, 6, 18, 28, and 29.

Claims 4, 7, and 19 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1, 6, and 18 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1, 6, and 18 are allowable.

Applicants respectfully submit the rejection has been overcome and request that it be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By: Christopher P. Rauch  
Christopher P. Rauch  
Registration No. 45,034  
SONNENSCHNEIDER NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP  
P.O. Box 061080  
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower  
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080  
(312) 876-8000  
Customer No. 26263